

# Christianity and Crisis



*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*

VOL. XIV, No. 4

MARCH 22, 1954

\$2.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

## Point Four

CHESTER BOWLES' *Ambassador's Report* is highly profitable reading for many reasons. Not the least is the moving story of Point Four accomplishment as he himself encountered it during his stay in India. It would be good indeed if the few chapters dealing with this subject were read by everyone. It would help to awaken the American people, as they have not yet been aroused, to the meaning and value of this great enterprise.

And out of this first hand experience Mr. Bowles says that as the Marshall Plan, costing the money equivalent of two weeks of warfare, helped to restore the productivity of Europe, stopped the advance of communism and may yet prove to be the best investment this country has ever made, so also Point Four is potentially the most powerful and constructive program against chaos and communism which the Free World has devised. "After seeing Point Four in action in the villages of Asia I predict it will go down in history as the most creative idea of our generation. . . . The last thing the Kremlin wants is to see a successful democratic program of world development."

Certainly the harsh events of the last forty years have opened our minds to the compelling necessity of such an enterprise. We can be in no doubt today as to our real enemy. Twenty years ago Arnold Toynbee said that the fundamental cause of the crisis with which our Western Civilization is confronted today is "the stagnation of the masses." The primary enemy is poverty, hunger, misery, disease; the inequality of circumstance in our world . . . the inequality of racial circumstance in what has been a white man's world; the inequality of economic circumstance which bears down too hard on too many people; the frustration and despair in millions of lives. And there is a revolt on against this fact in the name of human dignity. Under a just God this revolt is long overdue. It is not communism, though the communists seek to take advantage of it for their own malevolent ends. It is a legitimate aspiration

of the human spirit reaching for a better, fuller life for himself and his children.

We know how deeply this concerns us, for many reasons. No generation that has ever lived on this planet has had greater occasion than our own to learn and inwardly digest the truth of an ancient principle: namely, that we are members of one another, and if one member suffers all the members suffer with it; and the further insight of our own day that in this kind of world "if we would save ourselves we must also save others," and if we will not save others we shall not even save ourselves. We ought to know this.

This great program of technical and financial assistance, carried on by United Nations and by our country, does something about the world's unrest, and helps to make revolt unnecessary by removing or mitigating its causes and by holding out to peoples the valid hope of self-improvement. For four years technicians of all kinds, doctors, nurses, teachers, agriculturalists, sanitary engineers, home economists, veterinarians, have penetrated almost two score countries, training selected groups in each land how to lift their own people out of the rut of centuries, "helping the Bedouins of Jordan to grow grass on the desert, the farmer of India to increase his yield five-fold, the mother of Indo-China to save the eyes of her baby with a ten-cent tube of aureomycin." And through it all building a back-log of good will which could be had in no other way. Once again an ancient parable of High Religion is seen as soundest politics: "*I was hungry and you gave me food. . . . I was sick and you visited me. . . . I was in prison and you came to me.*"

If only the people of America could catch a vision of the enormous possibilities of this enterprise, and take fire! So that again this country might be animated by a sense of mission, captured by a high purpose, a purpose broader and more constructive than that of the containment of Russian communism by military might alone, which so many of our friends

abroad fear is the only idea we have. For while under present world conditions we are compelled to build up our military power against any fateful future contingency, yet we all know that by itself this is not enough. Point Four offers us another essential tool if we are to help shape a new world in freedom.

One would think that the Church especially would be highly excited over this enterprise. In many respects it is an extension of the Church's own missionary program, but on a vast scale to meet a still vaster need. An Iranian educator expressed surprise that anyone should consider the Point Four program a new idea: "There has been such work done in my country by Americans for the last 119 years." And for the young people of the United States and other lands, by fitting themselves to have an adequate part in this beneficent enterprise, here is the opportunity to serve the ideal of One World Under God, so often on our lips.

To fail to extend this program to the very limit of our capacity to carry it, is to miss the opportunity of a thousand years.

W. S.

### Editorial Notes

For a long time it seemed to us that the principal peril of McCarthyism consisted in the pretext for Europeans and Asians to caricature us and make it appear that we were on the perilous edge of fascism. It seemed to give them the occasion for venting their resentments against the dominant power and for expressing their animus against our real and fancied failings.

Then the President held his news conference after the Stevens and McCarthy affair, and our heart sank. It was so much like the European analogy of amiable and stupid respectability offering inept opposition to fascism in the hope of "containing" it. The President did not lash out at McCarthy for trying to draw capital out of the fact that the army chose to let a communist dentist withdraw rather than proceed with a probably futile court martial against him (futile because the dentist had not done anything but be a communist before he was drafted). Instead he elaborately fought on McCarthy's terms by assuring the nation that the fight against communism was important; that the army had made a mistake which was in the process of being corrected; that the generals were loyal and gallant, and that the two branches of government should show each other mutual respect.

There was nothing here about the respect that

all citizens deserve and the justice to which they are entitled. Nor was there any apology for permitting an inept Secretary of Army for capitulating before McCarthy after defying him. McCarthy was quick to prove that he knew how to exploit this kind of gentleness. He, McCarthy, was glad the President now agreed with him that the fight against communism was important (the adverb "now" was then elaborately withdrawn). The Senator was sorry only that the "tempest in a teapot" had given the "extreme left wing press and radio" a chance to rejoice but he was sure that their joy was of short duration. The "extreme left wing press" includes, of course, such papers as the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, and the *New York Herald Tribune*. McCarthy's persistent technique of labelling everyone "extreme left wing" who does not agree with him smacks of the familiar fascist technique of regarding everything to the left of center as tainted with communism; just as the communists threaten democracy by regarding everything right of center as tantamount to fascism.

The performance of the whole administration, occasioned by McCarthy's bout with the army was, in short, without dignity and self-respect. It was deeply disturbing to all who think that even a solid democracy may be corrupted by the persistent "coddling" of a bully.

R. N.

### Correspondence

Sirs:

Under date of February 5, an item appeared in the *New York Times* entitled "Germ War Deal Balked—Company Refuses to Operate Military's 3 Main Plants."

The article described the invitation to the Mathieson Chemical Corporation of Baltimore to manage "three main germ warfare plants" and states as the reasons for their refusal to do so "the administrative and business problems involved, and the mass destruction the weapon would create." This last phrase would seem to indicate that "ruthless" capitalism is here at least more considerate and ethical than the Government.

This is the first intimation I have seen that the United States was embarking on germ warfare and already has "three main plants" for that purpose. That news is both surprising and shocking to me.

Do our people know of the step which our Government has taken, and if so, do they approve? How can we profess to be sincerely concerned about the welfare of mankind if we resort to this fiendish method to accomplish our ends?

Faithfully yours,  
The Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham,  
New York, New York

# People and Things

ELIZABETH W. MUSSER

THE principles of relationship laid down by Martin Buber in his book *I and Thou*, and further developed by Dr. Reuel Howe in his new book *Man's Need and God's Action*, raise questions that need to be answered by individuals in actual day by day experience. In both of these books, we learn that we live in a two-fold relationship—the relationship with things and the relationship with people. It is God's intention that we should use things and love people, and when we reverse the order, as we so often do, by loving things and using people, we are violating a very principle of the universe, and we become frustrated, lonely, and sad. What do we mean by this and how can we translate it into experience? How is this word made flesh?

I remember in one of the chapters of Jan Struthers' book *Mrs. Miniver*, entitled "A Pocket Full of Pebbles," she tells how during the day she gathered up little incidents, not from the big experiences of life, but the small, daily round of incidents; and how she shared them with her family at meal times. It is my intention to reach down into a "pocket full of pebbles" to share them, with the invitation that you consider your own examples and see if they become illumined for you in the light of this two-fold relationship to people and things.

Things. How important are they? People will object when they hear that content of curriculum, material necessities, and profits in business, for example, are of secondary importance, and they will stoutly defend the idea that they are of essential importance. I should like to suggest an approach that, in the curious paradox that often accompanies Christian thought, makes things both more and less important at the same time; the consideration of things as sacraments of relationship. Recently, we experienced a wedding, a funeral, and a church group in one week. In each of these experiences, things became of utmost importance because they were symbols of something that was deep and abiding, and not of importance in themselves.

The wedding was one of great beauty, and the feeling of the relationship of love and trust and hope was very apparent to all who attended—the relationship between the bride and the groom, and among the members of the family known as an unusually strong and close family group. There was a very network of relationship apparent—with the parents of the bride, with the two sisters who were bridesmaids, reaching out to the friends. Because these relationships were so real, all of the material accompaniment of the wedding took on special signifi-

cance. The flowers, the bridesmaids' dresses, the beauty of the church, and above all, the ring became sacraments of relationship. There are also occasions in which the consideration of things, as ends in themselves, results in the destruction of their real value.

The funeral was held for a woman who had, for all the years of her life, been known and loved for the gaiety and graciousness of her spirit. Her husband, a man of eighty-seven years, had been active all his life in business, and his chief contribution was in this field of relationships, which now included the fourth generation, the great grandsons of men he had known in the early days of lumbering. All of this seemed very real as friends gathered for the memorial service, and as the old man greeted his closest business associates, some of whom had come a great distance. There was again apparent this deep and almost overwhelming sense of belonging one to another. The music and flowers took on meaning beyond themselves as expressions of love and sympathy and friendship; these also may lose their importance through the very fact of giving them too much importance. Fortunately, our present day culture seems to be getting away from the ostentation and overemphasis of former funeral practices.

Perhaps there is no place where this is more directly applicable than to the church itself. The particular group in question was meeting for a two-weeks' conference, and during that time, the men were gathered together in an informal atmosphere without the benefit or handicap of clerical vestments. They became related to each other as people. One wishes that the laity could have a chance to see the ministers of the church in this simple, unadorned fashion more often. When one starts with a sense of the church being a fellowship of the concerned, and then works through to an appreciation of the sacraments and symbols, one gains a real appreciation for what they stand for; for taken from the other approach, the emphasis on ritual and symbols can become hollow, and even an idolatry in which the relationship with God and with man takes second place.

So much for examples of our relationship to things. How then shall we love people and become channels through which God can speak His love? Reuel Howe says that God speaks to man through man and communicates His infinite love through our finite love. We ask again, "How does this take place in our lives?" And we are told that a child first gets his idea of God from his father. This is ap-



palling. We think of the story of two little boys who were discussing Christmas. One said, "Do you believe in Santa Claus?" And the other replied, "No. He is like the devil. He's your father." Now, it seems that in addition to being the devil and Santa Claus, father must also become God. We know that however inadequate we may feel, this is a part of our task as parents. We know this to be true as we sit by the bedside of a child struggling to regain consciousness after surgery. As we pray for her to be sustained by the strength of God's presence, we know that we are at that moment the channel through which God may work. Much of the child's sense of trust can come through us and become part of her foundation of trust in God for the rest of her life. Or, take the case of a six-year-old who was to have a metabolism test. The doctor explained that he could almost never do a basal metabolism at this age and doubted if it would be successful but felt it necessary to try. The mother's start had to be with herself—to let go of any apprehension that might communicate itself to her child. Next, came a demonstration with a clothespin, letting the youngster put it on her nose and practice breathing into a funnel through her mouth so that she would know how it would feel. Then the mother sent her off to the hospital with a prayer in her heart. Forty minutes later, back came a relaxed, unconcerned child, and the test was complete. Who is to say whether it was the prayer, or the clothespin on her nose, or the wonderfully accepting nurse and doctor which did the trick? My belief is that it was all of them combined, most of all, the deep resources within the child herself, and that God was at work through all of them.

When we begin to sense such things, even vocabulary changes. Pride becomes gratitude, and this mother's prayer of thanks was not "I am so proud of my child," but "so thankful." Another change in vocabulary that seems indicated if we are to love people and use things is that we will not talk of *sending* our children to camp or to school as if they were parcel post bundles. Instead, recognizing each individual as a perfectly unique child of God—no other like him in all the world since time began, we will be conscious of trying to work out decisions *with* him that will work toward the greatest possible fulfillment of his own very special self.

When we look on life this way, there can be a radiance to even the smallest, most insignificant event. Two rosy-cheeked four-year-olds come up from the garden early in May clutching in their grimy, little hands huge bunches of daffodils, all broken off at the very heads. There is the immediate reaction of anger—"Those naughty children—my favorite flowers," but before the thought breaks out

into words, another thought comes to the rescue—"Love people, use things." Flowers *are* important, but children are more so, and besides, they are being presented as an offering of love to you. Dare you reject this gift? And so you take them with thanks and arrange them in water; and only after this, do you explain how much you enjoy seeing flowers in their natural growing places, and that next time you would like, please, to be asked before the tulips suffer the same sad fate.

Apparently, it is in the accumulation of experiences that a child develops meanings for his life and grows into an attitude of trust in God because he has had experiences with trusting people which prevailed over his experiences of the untrustworthiness of people. For let us not deceive ourselves, we all receive both, and we all supply both, but each experience of trust makes us stronger to bear the experience of mistrust. Don't we see it happening all the time? Who will forget the doctor who came ninety miles from a medical meeting at 1:00 in the morning to see one's sick child, and not feel that he senses God's love working through the doctor's love? Another doctor, I remember, came to see our baby who was extremely ill. He did all he could for him at the hospital and because I was all alone, he said, "Come on. I've called my wife. You're going home with me." Indeed, that evening the cock-tails and the dinner became sacraments of relationship, and their friendship and love communicated God's love in a very real sense. Have you noticed how often food does become a means of relationship, especially to growing boys? A chocolate cake can say more than any word. When we remember that God chose a mortal man to communicate the greatest gift of all, His love, and that in the sacrament of Communion, Jesus used the common food of his day, we get a glimpse of the way God wants us to use this two-fold relationship to people and things; then, even the smallest thing becomes related and significant—the bow on a child's hair, the candles on a birthday cake—all assume an importance far beyond their intrinsic value. Remembering this, we can take the bacon and eggs and the peanut butter sandwiches of every day, and, giving thanks, offer them to Him, for use in our relationships with His children—and ours.

But what happens when you cannot love a child, either because he is being so unlovable, or because in a situation your love cannot follow him as far as he seems to need it? To take the second question first, we will have to realize that God is working and speaking to our children through other lives than our own, and sometimes all we can do is to surrender that youngster to God's action through others.

("Every partial relationship leads to the Eternal," says Martin Buber in *I and Thou*.) As an illustration of this, an older friend tells of an incident which she remembers after more than fifty years. As a small child, she was required by her grandfather to learn a Bible verse each week. One week the verse was, "*When thy mother and father forsake thee, the Lord will take thee up.*" She says that this terrified her, and the Lord seemed very obscure and far away until one afternoon she climbed up into the lap of her favorite uncle and pleaded, "When my father and mother forsake me, will *you* take me up?" And after he promised that he would, she was never quite so afraid again. Or take the case of a small boy starting kindergarten for the first time. For a month prior to the opening day, he was extremely anxious and worried about this new adventure that lay before him. His family did all that they could dream up to help allay his fears. A trip was made to the school where he slid on the slides, viewed the blackboards, drank out of every bubble fountain, and even found the location of the toilets. This all helped, but at the end of the tour, he pin-pointed his fears by saying, "I am not shy of any of those things. They don't have faces, and teachers do. Where is my teacher?" On the opening day, accompanied by his mother, he did find the teacher, and fortunately, she had a smiling face, but the next morning presented the real challenge of going out and hopping on a bus and starting out from home on his own. As the big yellow bus approached, and the doors swung open, there was a moment of panic in which it seemed he could not go, and then, he looked up into the face of the bus driver and said, "Good Morning. What is your name?" When the bus driver answered, "Bob," which was also the child's name, the hurdle was cleared, and then a small girl called out, "Come on, Bobby, and sit beside me." His mother felt that these two were indeed angels of the Lord and she could surrender her child to them and to all those others who would be helping him build meanings for his life. In some way, I believe this lies at the heart of intercessory prayer.

But how can we love and accept our child when he is most unlovable, for as Dr. Howe points out, this is when he is in the greatest need of love. Well, first of all, we must face the fact that we cannot, at least to the degree that he needs it; and yet, to the extent that we are able to love the unlovable, we are required to do so. How else can we understand that God's love is a gift freely given, not needing to be earned or justified by being worthy, and a child needs—we all need desperately—to know that he can make mistakes and still be loved. And so with God's love—we do not need to earn it by being

good. Indeed, how could we? All we have to do is to accept it. And how else can we accept it other than by accepting each other to the extent that we are able? This cannot be done by word alone. A child came home from school with a little note laboriously written out in her childish writing, "I need a smock. I need a blanket. I need name tapes." Absently, the mother laid the note aside and went off to a Sunday School meeting where the theme was largely on the need to accept the children coming into our Church Schools—a thrilling meeting. Still in a glow the next morning, the mother was rudely reminded by her small, angry child that she had done nothing to meet this youngster's needs. As she came downstairs with the blanket and smock in her arms, they did indeed seem like sacraments—tangible symbols of acceptance.

Another story has a special meaning for me because it is a true one in the life of our family. One Christmas season a few days before *the day*, a prayer group gathered at our home for one of the most beautiful mornings any of us can ever remember. The talk given by our oldest and wisest and most discerning member was a thrilling one. The meditations seemed especially meaningful, and toward the end a friend with an exquisite voice sang for us. The music was so beautiful that we made a tape recording of her singing "Oh, Holy Night," and as she left, I thanked her, saying, "This is all I could ask of Christmas, and I will be able to preserve your beautiful gift in that recording." That afternoon, as I came in from some errands, I called the family to me and said, "There is a real treat I want to share with you," and prepared to play the recording. As we turned it on, there was a garble of sound—chopsticks, laughter, shouts and screams, and hidden away in the background, just the remnants of this beautiful Christmas song. Our daughter and some friends had been playing with the tape recorder, and through misunderstanding, instead of continuing on, had recorded over the earlier portion, thereby destroying our record. It was a moment of indescribable horror, and I do not believe I ever felt so angry and sad, all at the same time. I simply threw myself into my husband's arms and wept; and then, after a while, in a pause, I heard the sound of sobbing in the other room, and realized it was my child. As I went in to her, she raised her head and said, "Mummy, don't give me anything for Christmas this year. I don't deserve it after what I have done." And this was enough to restore me to my senses too. As I gathered her in my arms, I said, "I guess I wouldn't know anything about Christmas if there weren't the meaning of forgiveness." So then, we both wept, but this time

it was not bitter because we were together. I share this story with you as an example of our two-fold relationship with things and with people in the hopes that it will call to mind events in your own experience that may become illumined in the way

that this story was for me, and that as we go through our lives in the daily rounds of seemingly unimportant details, we may gain a surer sense of God's presence everywhere, in all, through all, and over all, that will give meaning to all of life.

## The Significance of the Growth of "Christian Action"

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

IN September of 1951, the organization known as "Christian Action" was founded in a meeting held at Howard University, Washington, D. C. Since that time, the organization has grown consistently and now numbers 850 members in 42 states and 9 countries and territories outside of the U. S. A. There are local chapters in the following cities: New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Cleveland, New Haven, Madison, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia and Washington; other chapters are being organized in St. Louis, St. Paul, Rochester, New York, Detroit, St. Paul and Minneapolis, Dallas and Denver.

This merely numerical record of the growth of an organization does not, however, tell the real story. That story is of the effort of American Protestantism to respond adequately to the responsibilities of the Christian in a technical society and an atomic age for the establishment of justice in all relations of life.

The original statement of principles, adopted at the organizing meeting, expressed the ethos of the organization in the words: "We are a group of Christians, . . . seeking to discern the judgment of God upon ourselves and . . . to fulfill our common responsibilities under God. . . . We believe that the Gospel of Jesus Christ summons us to face fearlessly the political, economic, and social realities of our time, and to act responsibly for the healing of the whole man and society." The statement goes on in more specific terms to declare that "the Gospel impels us to work together for a responsible society . . . which will give each person and group a fair and equal opportunity to develop his full potentialities." The organization further states its conviction that its purposes must be accomplished through the churches because "The true church is God's instrument, properly transcending, class, racial, and national loyalties."

Even this statement of purpose and principle does not explain the success of the organization which, since its birth, has developed into a healthy national organization, embracing members of all denominations. It has held two national conferences since its inception and has gathered members together in

various regional conferences. The Secretary of Christian Action is The Rev. Robert Gessert and the Chairman is Prof. John C. Bennett. The annual budget now is \$16,000.00. The organization publishes a quarterly *Christianity and Society* in which social and political issues are analyzed; and also a monthly news letter.

The reasons for the growth of "Christian Action" may be briefly stated. A) The Christian Faith must come to terms not only with individual problems but with the problems of human togetherness in all communities, sub-national, national and international. It must, in other words, seek to make the love commandment relevant to the complex problems of justice which have taken on more perplexing dimensions in a highly technical society facing the perils of an atomic age. B) Socially sensitive Christians must, before they can offer the positive resources of the Christian faith to a perplexed community, counter the Christian "heresies" of various types which make Christianity irrelevant to the solution of any social issues. Of such aberrations, the chief errors are an extravagant individualism which tries to gain religious sanction for a very heretical (from a Christian standpoint) *laissez faire* economic theory; and a quietism and pietism which can serve the frightened conscience as an escape from social responsibilities; and an extravagant legalism usually expressed in sabbatarianism and prudish sexual ethics which may well be suspected of offering "ersatz" forms of righteousness for those who have an uneasy conscience about unsolved problems of racial and economic justice. It was in challenging these Protestant aberrations that the so-called "social gospel" first gained the ear of the nation and exercised the conscience of the church. "Christian Action" must obviously be dedicated to challenging these same errors which express themselves rather more extravagantly in our age than in the epoch when the "social gospel" arose. The fact that the National Council of Churches, which usually has no difficulty in expressing a rather unanimously held conviction about our responsibilities as a nation to the world community, cannot usually express itself unequivocally



on domestic affairs because a group of conservative laymen insist on the same pious rendering of the old economic individualism which first challenged the conscience of the church,—this fact reveals the necessity of an unofficial organization. For there is no possibility of getting agreement on economic issues in the official church even though there is a growing consensus on a pragmatic approach to economic issues. Protestantism must simply accept the fact that economic interests do tend to color even religio-moral judgments. When this taint is not challenged the pretensions which are made for economic theories in the name of religion tend to become intolerable.

C) "Christian Action" has set itself the task of resisting the same tendencies which the "social gospel" movement challenged but its third and probably most important task is to re-think the social message of Christianity in the light of the obvious failure of the "social gospel." This failure became the more apparent as our generation faced the problems and perils of the twentieth century with its tyrannies, its cold wars and the prospects of atomic destruction. The "social gospel" was informed by the ideals and illusions of a "liberal" age which could not cope with these dread realities and possibilities. The right wing of the "social gospel" thought it would be sufficient to instruct Christians in the social implications of the love commandment. It even warned against "the secular passion to get justice in place of the evangelical passion to give justice." It was, in short, not aware of the persistence and power of individual and collective self-interest in the field of politics and economics. Its idealism was, therefore, ultimately as irrelevant as the individualism and legalism which it sought to displace.

The left wing of the "social gospel" was properly scornful of these sentimentalities which did not fit any known social realities. But it unfortunately saw these realities only through Marxist spectacles. It tried to christianize Marxism by hoping for an economic system in which "motives of service" would supplant "motives of profit." The hope that any system would guarantee motives either good or bad was of course heretical from any Christian standpoint. The explicit communist sympathy on the left wing was very minimal, but unfortunately the few genuine Stalinists controlled two unofficial denominational groups. The tolerance toward this kind of politics in the church by Christians who did not agree with it but thought no church group could be "prophetic" without tolerating "radicalism" (even if that radicalism offered an alternative to the injustices of the present order which was definitely worse) is one of the perplexing phenomena

of the religious life which "Christian Action" must face. It was significant of this problem that upon its inception and its condemnation of all forms of tyranny and of sympathizers with totalitarianism, "Christian Action" was sagely advised by that thoroughly non-communist weekly *The Christian Century* that it was inadvisable to exclude fellow travelers from a "liberal" religious organization since "unofficial social action groups are most valuable if they provide a meeting ground for liberals and radicals." The idea that the "liberal" pudding would be rather insipid if it was not spiced by "radicalism" which was equated with Stalinist illusions, proves how much any viable "social Christianity" must clarify on the left before it can effectively challenge the right.

While the new organization has had a remarkable success it must be apparent that it faces a formidable obstacle in dispensing, as a matter of principle, with precisely those social panaceas and dogmas from the right and left which have been the bane of our political and religious life. But the resulting thoroughly pragmatic approach to social issues can appeal only to the more mature, whether maturity is measured in political or religious terms.

One of the effects of this movement is that the breach between ourselves and the continent of Europe on social outlook in the churches is in the process of being healed. What seemed to us a completely transcendental outlook, coupled with political irresponsibility in continental Protestantism, has given way to the new sense of social responsibility learned in the engagement with two forms of totalitarianism. What seemed to the continent, on the other hand, like the sentimentalities of the "social gospel," has given way to a new realism. The resulting pragmatic approach to political issues is thoroughly "ecumenical" as the coming Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches will probably establish. It may not be a coincidence that the chairman of "Christian Action," Professor John C. Bennett, is also one of the leading members of the World Council Commission on "The Church and a Responsible Society."

In one sense, we may have spoken too much about the various viewpoints from which social issues are seen. The real task is to prevent particular viewpoints, ideologies and panaceas from deterring us from an honest and courageous reaction to injustice, whether in defending the rights of a racial minority against the pride and arrogance of the majority or in resisting the present mania known as "McCarthyism" which would annul cherished standards of justice in the name of defending them against communism. A Christian group must provide a fellow-

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*  
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT  
*Co-Chairmen*

M. SEARLE BATES	LISTON POPE
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN	WILLIAM SCARLETT
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
AMOS N. WILDER	

MARION HAUSNER, *Secretary*

## CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	

ship of courage as well as a meeting ground for the clarification of ideas. And perhaps it is not so much courage that is needed as honesty in brushing out various forms of pretension in the church which confuse the issue when we confront an obvious injustice.

Detroit Public Library  
Book Receiving Dept.  
5201 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit 2, Mich.

27462 11-54

## American Christian Palestine Committee Adopts Statement

In the National Conference of the American Christian Palestine Committee on February 16, 1954, resolutions were passed and it was recommended that our government continue to help both Israel and the Arab states. The recommendations follow:

1. The United States ought to contribute to the relief and resettlement of each group's refugee population and grant increased economic and technical assistance.

2. Our government should continue to encourage regional development of the areas' water resources so that all peoples may be the benefactors.

3. Our government ought continue to support, as it did in the Fifth General Assembly, the appointment of a commission with authority limited to the supervision of the holy places only, leaving all political concerns in Jerusalem to the respective governments of Israel and Jordan.

4. Our government ought protest to the United Nations Security Council the illegal stoppage by Egypt of Israel-bound ships in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Elat.

5. Our Government, in cooperation with the United Nations, should continue to work for the most equitable solution of the Arab refugee problem by resettling these men, women, and children of the potentially plentiful lands of the several Arab nations.

The resolutions read as follows:

"We urge that our government support all efforts to have the Arab States negotiate directly with Israel, for in this way only can peace be brought to the Holy Land, the sanctuary wherein have been nourished the historic hopes of mankind for brotherhood."

The statement was signed by the Resolutions Committee of which Dr. Samuel Guy Inman is Chairman. Prof. James Luther Adams, The Rev. Karl Baehr, Dr. John W. Bradbury, Harry W. Flannery, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, The Rev. Dr. Jesse W. Stitt, Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, and Prof. Albert N. Williams also signed the statement. It was adopted by unanimous vote of the delegates to the National Conference of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

*We have received 200 new subscribers to Christianity and Crisis through the names suggested to us by old subscribers. This success prompts us to suggest that subscribers who have not sent in names of friends who might be interested in our journal might do so now. We would be most grateful for this help in extending the circle of our readers.*

## Author in This Issue

Mrs. Elizabeth W. Musser lives in St. Paul, Minnesota, is a housewife and mother of four children, and active in the Protestant Episcopal Church.